ACTIVITY/EVENT	PREVIOUS DATE	REVISED DATE
Summary Judgment Hearing	April 10, 2006	April 24, 2006
Lodging of Preliminary Pretrial and Trial Setting Statement and Proposed Order	April 7, 2006	April 21, 2006
Preliminary Pretrial and Trial Setting Conference	April 17, 2006	May 1, 2006
Close of Expert Discovery	30 days before trial	30 days before trial

No previous continuance of the Preliminary Pretrial and Trial Setting Conference has been requested.

The proposed two-week continuance of the hearing on the summary judgment motion is necessary to accommodate plaintiff's counsel's request for a two-week extension of the date that plaintiff's opposition is due and adhere to the schedule prescribed by Local Rule 7-2. The corresponding continuance of the Preliminary Pretrial and Trial Setting Conference) ("PTC") preserves the current sequence and interval between the summary judgment hearing and the PTC. The reasons and basis for the requested changes are set forth in the following declaration.

DECLARATION

- I, Marc P. Fairman, being first duly sworn, declare as follows:
- 1. I am counsel of record for plaintiff George Sanchez and submit this declaration in support of the stipulation for 14-day continuance of the hearing on defendants' motion for summary judgment and preliminary pretrial and trial setting conference.
- 2. The September 29, 2005 Scheduling Order set the PTC for April 17, 2006 and February 27, 2006 as the last day for hearing case-dispositive motions. The deadline for the hearing of case-dispositive motions was changed to April 10, 2006 by prior stipulation and order.
- 3. Defendants filed their summary judgment motion on March 6, 2006 and noticed the hearing for April 10, 2006, the 35-days minimum notice prescribed in Local Rule 7-2. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, plaintiff's opposition would have to be filed no later than March 20, giving him only 14-days to prepare a response to a motion consisting of a thirty-five page brief, two declarations and multiple exhibits. Because of unforeseen scheduling conflicts and demands

Case 5:04-cv-01683-JW Document 47 Filed 03/23/06 Page 3 of 3

1	in other cases, including two full days of jury service, the preparation and filing of a cert petition		
2	in the United States Supreme Court, an evidentiary hearing before the Public Utilities		
3	Commission and numerous other matters, I did not believe that I could prepare an adequate		
4	response to the motion within the allotted time and accordingly requested a two-week extension		
5	of the filing deadline, to which defense counsel agreed, subject to the Court's approval. The		
6	continuances are necessary to accommodate counsel's need for the extension of time to respond		
7	to the motion and allow the Court to hear it prior to the PTC.		
8	4. Counsel do not believe that the continuances will unduly delay or interfere with the		
9	orderly progress of the case.		
10	I declare under penalty of perjury of the law of California that the foregoing is true and		
11	correct this 21 th day of January 2005 in San Francisco, California.		
12			
13	/s /		
14	Marc P. Fairman		
15	SO STIPULATED:		
16	MARC P. FAIRMAN RICHARD DOYLE, City Attorney		
17	LAW OFFICES OF MARC P. FAIRMAN Professional Corporation NORA FRIMANN, Chief Trial Attorney CLIFFORD GREENBERG, Senior Deputy		
18	City Attorney OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY		
19			
20	By/s/		
21	Marc P. Fairman Clifford Greenberg Attorneys for Plaintiff Attorneys For Defendants		
22	Dated: March 21, 2006		
23			
24	SO ORDERED:		
25	United States District Judge		
26	Je mied States District raage		
27	Dated: MARCH 23, 2006		
28			